

REMARKS

The claims are 8 to 13.

The above amendment is responsive to issues raised in the Official Action.

In this regard, the presently recited separator is now defined as one which is formed from aramid paper which has been produced by forming a slurry of meta-aramid staple fibers, forming the fibers into a sheet and then subjecting the sheet to heat processing.

Support for new claims 8 and 9 is evident from the original claims as well as the specification e.g., at page 3, lines 29-34, page 6, lines 14-25 and the Examples at pages 7-9 of the present specification.

Support for new claim 10 is evident from page 5, lines 24 to 26.

Support for new claims 11 to 13 is evident from the above and original claims.

The significance of the above amendment will become further apparent from the remarks below.

With regard to the rejection in Official Action paragraph 3, the present claims 10 and 11 which are directed to electrical or electronic parts only recite "the separator" as set forth in claims 8 and 9 rather than the rejected term "separators".

With regard to the rejection or indefiniteness in Official Action paragraph 4 for claiming the invention in terms of physical properties rather than chemical or structural features that produce said properties, this is not the case.

An important feature of the presently claimed separator is that it consists essentially of aramid paper produced by forming a slurry of meta-aramid staple fibers, then forming the slurry into a sheet followed by heat processing.

The foregoing recitations concerning composition and structure, taken with the recited properties provides sufficient information to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to identify the product and to determine what will and will not infringe. Thus, one can readily produce and identify the separator as presently recited and subject it to the required testing to determine whether it falls within the scope of the present claims.

Claims 1-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Ohno et al. (CA 2,379,555). (The reference will hereinafter be referred to as Honda et al. since Honda is the first named inventor).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The separator of the present invention consists essentially of aramid paper which has a physical property as defined in new claim 8. This separator also meets all five important requirements for a separator disclosed in the present specification, at page 5, lines 9-18.

Honda et al. teaches a porous film separator produced by the casting a dope of meta-aramid, in contrast to aramid paper which is manufactured from a slurry of aramid staple fibers e.g. with a paper making machine (see the present specification, at page 6, lines 5-11).

Honda et al. in no way suggests the use of an aramid paper as presently recited for any purpose, no less as a separator for conductive electronic components.

Accordingly, the rejection of prior art is untenable and should be withdrawn.

With regard to the provisional double patenting rejections in Official Action paragraphs 8 to 10, it is respectfully requested that they be held in abeyance pending an indication that the claims of the present application are in condition for allowance. A telephone conversation with the Examiner confirmed that this was acceptable.

No further issues remaining, allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or proposals for expediting prosecution, please contact undersigned at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Shinji NARUSE

By: Matthew M. Jacob

Matthew M. Jacob
Registration No. 25,154
Attorney for Applicant

MJ/akl
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
March 18, 2009